UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

An Observer in Moscow

By SYDNEY STRONG

Mexico Is Becoming Fashionable

By ALSON H. ROBINSON

The British Elections

By HARRISON BROWN

Do We Want Peace?

By THOMAS J. WALSH

VOLUME CVIII NUMBER 11

Chicago, November 30, 1931

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago. Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 171
An Observer in Moscow—SYDNEY STRONG 173
Jottings—J. H. H 174

ARTICLES—
War Resistance—*H. G. Wells* 171
Mexico is Becoming Fashionable—ALSON H. ROBINSON 175
The British Elections—HARRISON BROWN 177
Do We Want Peace?—THOMAS J. WALSH 179

POETRY—
Hymn—*Anna Garlin Spencer* 176
Trumpets on New Horizons:
Autumn Thought—SYLVIA HILL 181
Injustice—WARREN ARIAIL 181
Toiler—HELEN ADAMS PARKER 181
Echo of Ages—JEWEL FULLER LANG 181

CORRESPONDENCE—
Rights of Conscience—the Macintosh Case—WILLIAM C. ALLEN 182
Gandhi May Possibly Come to America—JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND 182
From a Letter to a UNITY Subscriber—L. W. ROGERS 183

THE FIELD—
Resolutions passed at the Unitarian General Conference in Philadelphia 170

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Resolutions

Passed at the Meeting of the Unitarian General Conference in Philadelphia

The Depression and Social Planning:

Whereas: The Fourth Biennial Conference of the American Unitarian Association is assembled in the midst of an unprecedented industrial breakdown, due to the inherent weakness of our acquisitive society, which has resulted in suffering and deprivation for millions in America and all over the world; and,

Whereas: Our belief in the fundamental dignity of human nature makes it necessary that both as individuals and as churches we should do everything possible to alleviate the present suffering and prevent its repetition in the future,

Be It Hereby Resolved: That the Fourth Biennial Conference of the American Unitarian Association place on record the following statements and suggestions:

First: This Conference urges upon all our churches the necessity for generous support of the regular welfare and relief agencies of the community which will necessarily bear the burden of unemployment.

Second: It urges upon our churches the necessity for generous financial support of whatever special movement for unemployment relief are necessary during the coming year and also moral support for whatever supplementary governmental appropriation may be necessary.

Third: It suggests that all our churches give very careful consideration in their program during the year to the causes of the present situation, and the various methods which may be used both to alleviate it and to prevent its repetition; specifically a study of proposed federal and state legislation.

Fourth: It directs the officials of the American Unitarian Association and particularly its department of social relations to continue its study and research and to increase its cooperation with all agencies, religious and secular which are working toward the end of relief and prevention.

Fifth: It places on record its definite conclusion that the relief plans as at present proposed are inadequate and of a temporary nature, and that what is needed is a statesmanlike and constructive plan for a just social and economic order.

Sixth: Among the measures suggested which this Conference feels should have the support of the churches are the following:

(a) Immediate and adequate appropriation by national and local government for such needed and useful public works as road construction, development of parks, elimination of grade crossings, flood control projects, the clearing of slums in our cities, etc.

(b) Social insurance, covering un-

(*Continued on page* 183)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CVIII MONDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1931 Number 11

WAR RESISTANCE

"War resistance seems to me logically justified by the Kellogg Pact. If it is assumed that the world can do without war, it must be assumed also that proper organizations can be set up to ease the political, economic, social and biological stresses of mankind.

"In that case not only international warfare, but the preparation for international war also, become criminal activities and resistance to them a plain duty for the world citizen. But the two things depend upon one another, and I think there is no justification for the war-resister who is not prepared to work continually for the cosmopolitan organization of the common interests of men and who does not do everything in his or her power for the new education, the re-education of our race to meet its present needs and opportunities."

—*H. G. Wells,* in statement to "Peace Patriots" November 14th).

In the present war between President Hoover and the big navy people, the New York *Times* has done a great service not only to Mr. Hoover, but to the nation itself, in recalling to mind the provision written into the fifteen-cruiser bill two years ago by due action of Congress. This provision was to the effect that

". . . in the event of an international agreement, which the President is requested to encourage, for the further limitation of naval armament, the President is hereby authorized and empowered to suspend in whole or in part any of the naval construction authorized under this act."

It would seem as though the very contingency anticipated by this provision had now come to pass. At this moment the League of Nations is undertaking to establish "a naval holiday," which the President is seeking to "encourage" precisely as "requested" by Congress. In the near offing is the great Geneva disarmament conference which is due to meet, if we are correctly informed, next February. In the face of such events as these, says the Buffalo *Courier-Express,* is this law of Congress, empowering the President to suspend naval construction in whole or in part, to be "made a scrap of paper"? With true wisdom and courage, Mr. Hoover is serving the interests of national economy in a period of dire industrial distress by cutting down expenditures at the points where these expenditures are most wasteful and extravagant—namely, the army and navy budgets. This is public leadership of the highest order. But, more than this, the President is using the powers, expressly conferred upon him by Congress, to "encourage" international agreements looking toward disarmament by suspending naval construction during the difficult period of discussion and negotiation. That this policy endangers the security of the United States is of course ridiculous. But even if there were some peril, the hazard would be justified by the greatness of the end now being sought by distracted and overburdened nations.

Chickens certainly have a habit of coming home to roost! What has from the beginning embarrassed the western nations in their dealings with Japan in Manchuria, if not the records of these same nations in years gone by on issues precisely similar to that presented by the Chinese embroilment? France has been in the forefront of the endeavor to keep peace in Asia, thanks largely to the vision and courage of M. Briand. But look at what France did in China in years gone by, and more recently in Syria and Morocco. Britain, we have no doubt, is perfectly sincere in her remonstrances against Japan's warlike policy in Manchuria. But if there is any country in the world which should keep silent on Chinese matters, it would seem to be Great Britain. As for our own country, what is Japan doing in Asia but what the United States has done again and again in the West Indies and in Central and South America—namely, used an army (or marines) to protect investments, guarantee treaty right, and vindicate national honor? In saying all this, let it be understood, we are not defending Japan. Heaven forbid! Rather are we trying simply to point out that there is nothing new or strange in what the Mikado's Empire is doing, and that the western nations are failing to stay Japanese policy only because this policy has for generations been their own. Not even a new instrumentality like the League of Nations can hide this fact. But it is a tragedy that the League should have to carry this burden of the guilt of its own members and associates in undertaking to achieve its beneficent work for peace. Perhaps it is because the League is built of such rotten material that it is proving so ineffective in these great crises in the world's affairs.

Among the events of our time upon which the historian of the future will have much to say, is the almost universal breakdown of the parliamentary or representative system of government. Russia threw over the system, so far as it had developed at all in

the Tsar's Duma, with a fine gesture of scorn in 1917, and has been ruled by a dictatorship ever since. Mussolini destroyed the Italian parliament, and rules in his own right with a power of sovereignty that makes even the king look ridiculous. Germany took precautions to provide for a dictatorship in her Weimar constitution, and has used it ever since the breaking of the financial crisis in the early summer. Britain, stricken by a similar crisis, summoned the Lords and Commons, but ruled the realm in all emergency measures by orders in council, as the German government has ruled for months by presidential edicts. And President Hoover, in refusing deliberately to call Congress into special session for the special business incident to domestic ills and foreign perils during the summer, preferred to take executive action on his own authority. All this shows an amazing distrust of representative institutions, or already a discovery that such institutions can no more be relied upon to do the work of peace than the work of war. It makes one wonder as to what is to befall our democracy which, up to a few years ago, was universally regarded as one of the major achievements of our western world. Perhaps our South American republics were only anticipating us in their revolutionary reliance upon dictatorships. For ourselves, however, we are suspicious of all such trends of the times. We cannot agree with Bernard Shaw that this is progress. On the contrary, we regard it as one more indication of the breakdown of our civilization which in one way or another has been going steadily to pieces ever since the War. When we see "the mother of parliaments" deliberately robbed of her functions by a Socialist prime minister, we despair indeed.

The *Christian Register,* referring to the recent Unitarian General Conference in Philadelphia, describes it as "A Record of Great Resolutions." We endorse this characterization of a deliberate action of a church body on matters of controversial public interest which excells any other record of which we chance to know. The Unitarians, safely delivered from the Brahmanic atmosphere of Boston, faced questions of the most acute and dangerous character. They looked at the present business depression, found its causes in the "inherent weakness of our acquisitive society," endorsed unemployment insurance (otherwise known as "the dole"), and took a leaf right out of the Bolshevik scriptures in recognizing the necessity on a world-wide scale of "cooperative planning." They turned to the vexing question of Professor Macintosh, protested in the name of "liberty of conscience" against the decision of the Supreme Court, and pledged themselves "to all possible efforts to move Congress to find some relief." They remembered "the deplorable situation existing in the soft coal regions of West Virginia, Illinois, and Kentucky," and undertook an appeal for assistance of the "thousands of men, women and children utterly destitute." They called for the progressive disarmament of the nations at the forthcoming Geneva Conference, and urged "the adherence of the United States to the World Court before the Disarmament Conference meets." Above all, it faced the dilemma of the independence of the Philippines, and stripped away the political hypocrisy involved by calling upon the President and Congress "to define what is meant" in their promises by the phrase "stable government." These resolutions are so notable that we print them in full this week in our department, "The Field." We wish that Washington had half the statesmanship and courage displayed by our Unitarian brethren.

We are reminded by further action of the Unitarian Conference above referred to that October last marked the four hundredth anniversary of the publication of Michael Servetus's epoch-making book, *"De Trinitatis Erroribus"* (On the Errors of the Trinity). This volume is of great interest to Unitarians, since its appearance constitutes one of the earliest and most important dates in the history of the Unitarian movement. But it has a significance far transcending all sectarian lines, since Servetus's work in theology was like Galileo's work in science—the effort of a brave man, of great intellectual ability, in an age of blind and cruel intolerance, to match truth against the dogmas of superstition. Servetus, unlike the aged Galileo, did not deny his heresy when challenged to recant. On the contrary, his stubborn fidelity carried him straight to that awful pyre in Geneva, the horror of which has not been obliterated even by the expiatory movement which now marks its historic site. Servetus was a remarkable man. His farseeing anticipation of contemporary radicalism in Christian thought is balanced by his amazing anticipation in the field of medical science of Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood. But his memory must be forever associated primarily with his heroic martyrdom. When a man dies either willingly or unwillingly for truth, his name takes on a golden lustre which makes it as imperishable as the shining stars. Few read Servetus's book today. It must be collecting almost as much dust as Calvin's "Institutes" itself. But the tale of that ghastly killing, when for a dogma a noble soul was slain, must endure so long as the history of mankind is told.

It was fifty years ago that the Revised Version of the Bible was published in England, and in a slightly different form in the United States. The London *Times* thinks that this anniversary of a notable achievement of scholarship, which took ten years to complete, and engaged the attention of the best Old Testament

and New Testament authorities of the English-speaking world, offers little real occasion for jubilation. The fact is, of course, that the Revised Version has never won any general acceptance either in pulpit or pew. It is studied in theological schools and read in ministers' libraries, but otherwise the book has fallen into disuse. The reason is obvious. While correcting mis-translations in the old King James Version of the Bible, and to this extent offering a genuine service—in some cases an invaluable service, as in the famous instance of the substitution of the word "love" for the word "charity" in the 13th chapter of I Corinthians—the new version fails completely to meet the literary challenge of the old. The Authorized (King James) Version is in many ways the proudest movement of English literature. It fashioned the language as we know it in all its power and beauty in our time. Many of its passages are themselves an enduring part of this literature, known of all men in precisely the form passed down by the king's translators. Nothing but a new translation of equal worth could displace this original immortal achievement as wrought into the very life and thought of the English people, and this the Revised Version is most decidedly *not*. On the contrary, in literary style and form it is not only not good, but from certain points of view is bad. It is easily surpassed by later translations, of which Moffatt and Goodspeed are interesting examples. Nevertheless, for all its failure, we will do well to remember at this half-century mark the labors of devoted men, and to express gratitude for a work which was not without its fruitful results.

An Observer in Moscow

The journey from Berlin to Moscow, via Warsaw, takes thirty-six hours. We traveled third class going, and second class returning. Neither is bad, and each has its advantages. In the third class one sits up all night (sleeping as he can) and gets acquainted with the people. Third class costs about thirty dollars; second twice as much. It is a good idea to buy a comfortable rug in Berlin; some friend in Moscow will be willing to accept it.

Nearly a month spent in walking and driving (auto) about the city and suburbs—sixty miles north toward Leningrad, and twenty miles west up the river —offered opportunities. The landscape looked rarely beautiful, with autumn foliage. Calls were made upon Upton Close, Harry F. Ward, Julius Hecker, Arthur Watts (director of British Quaker relief in 1921-23, and now returned from Australia to throw in his lot as a builder in the big Soviet Republic); on Borodin and other eminent citizens of the Union. We visited the tomb of Lenin, whose spirit, like John Brown's, goes marching on. It is amazing how Lenin has in half a generation become the saint and guide of millions. This in itself constitutes a religion. We visited Tolstoy's museum, factory kitchens, collective farms, schools, etc.—going where fancy led.

As stated by Charles Recht of New York, the Soviet Union is a going concern. No doubt of this. Mr. Recht goes so far as to say that Americans now had better stay at home and "clean up their own yard." The Five-Year Plan is already a success, as judged by production and by the gigantic enterprises of construction completed or well under way,—and this from the Black and Caspian Seas to the Baltic, and eastward clear to the stretches of Siberia. The one thing that can cripple them is a war provoked by other nations. Even a war will not stay the final success of the enterprise. Russia will not provoke war.

We strolled about Moscow, and meditated many times on the relations between the two big Republics —the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. and what a pity it was that the two republics were not closer together in understanding,—and why not? Our countrymen might well remember what a stake they really have in Russia. In the first place, in the period of the Big Hunger American citizens and money went in abundance to the relief. In the next place, when Russians—cut off from the world—were struggling under the leadership of Krupskya (Lenin's wife) to establish an educational system, many Americans lent a helping hand in contributions of books, ideas and personal service. After that came the big American capitalists like Ford, Swope and others who gave the needed help in the nick of time. And now, there are 5,000 American engineers, like Cooper and Calder, who are scattered over the country giving their best for the up-building of the industries of the Soviet Union. Russia seems to appeal like a new West to these enterprising Americans, endowed with the pioneer spirit.

On the other hand, the Soviet Union has already made, and is sure to make more, contributions to America. It was refreshing to walk about Moscow at the hotels, in the stations, on the trains, and find life devoid of the tipping system. At the Grand Hotel we noted, "No charge for checking clothes." No titles are used—no "professors," no "sirs," no "countesses," no "colonels,"—but plain "citizens," as in the colonial days after the American Revolution. (The D. A. R. should take note). The streets are without uniforms except those worn by postmen, policemen and soldiers.

We know of no land in which greater equality exists. It is not perfect in this respect, but from one end of the land to the other, it would be difficult to find

the color line drawn. What is so dreadful a problem for America is no longer a problem in the Union! And, as for woman—in no land is woman so nearly an equal to man as in the Soviet Union—before the law, in social privileges, in educational opportunities, in holding offices, in recent rapid emancipation. The people of the Union may be said to have a passion for education, from the kindergarten up through the university. Very much remains to be done. Far greater illiteracy exists than in America. But the people are thoroughly awakened in hunger for an education, they are working according to the most modern models. So much so is this true, that a large number of American pedagogs are highly commending the procedure obtaining in Russian education. Our indebtedness is sure to increase.

There are two things that the Soviet Union is doing that will be sure to have wide influence: One is the considerate treatment of minorities and the granting of autonomy to lands brought under its sway —the other is in making the *Worker* the corner-stone of the new society that is being built. For all this America is sure to be indebted in the years to come. If the Soviet Union can succeed in building a society free from personal profit and acquisitiveness, it ought to have the very best wishes of Americans.

Nearly everyone wishes to know about religion. The reply is that the State and Church are separate. Of course, since the Church has dwindled for several reasons, there isn't much for the State to be separated from! People are permitted to worship as they desire, if it does not take on an anti-revolutionary aspect. The Church is no longer subsidized—on the contrary, it owns no buildings, can raise no public fund and is limited in its rights to teach and hold assemblies. We attended a service on a Saturday night, when 1500 persons were present. There were two antiphonal choirs, with splendid music. The ritualistic service was rich in ornaments and sprinkled with many processionals. Such services are however uncommon. The most effective offense against religion it seems to me is the adoption of the Five-Day Week and the blotting out of the "Days" of the calendar of Christendom. There is no longer in Russia such days as Monday, Tuesday . . . Saturday, Sunday! Each day is named the First, the Second . . . of November, of December . . . and so on up to the Thirtieth or Thirty-First. It is difficult to realize, without experiencing it, how completely the calendar of Christendom is blotted out in the Soviet Union.

The movement against religion is very strong. There is an Atheist's Museum in the heart of the city. The teaching in the schools is on a severely materialistic basis. One of the most beautiful churches in the world, a golden-domed cathedral, is being torn down, to give place to a Palace of the People. This is over-rough procedure, but reflection while walking about the city and an effort to be just compel us to recall what the Church of Russia had failed to do for the people—also that it was a Church of great superstition, that it had fought against the revolutionary movement. We recalled too that the period of our American Revolution was also a period of infidelity, that the Churches fell into disrepute. The things opposed by the Soviet citizens are similar in a high degree to those to which the Quakers and Pilgrims were greatly opposed, who abolished Christmas and Easter and protested against the "sacredness of churches." The Puritan, Cromwell, even stabled his horses in the cathedrals. Before we pass judgment, let us recall the deeds of our ancestors.

Three things that help in an understanding of what has happened in Russia are the hanging of Lenin's brother by the czarist government years ago; the long residence of Marx in East London in extreme poverty; the centuries of oppression of the masses by the State and Church of Russia. These explain the Revolution. The masses, with leaders who have a definite goal set before them, are struggling out of poverty and ignorance to secure a society in which their interests may be obtained and secured. The road has been rough for everybody, and rough days are not over. What they are doing constitutes a menace to old ways, and a challenge to other nations to put first the welfare of the workers of the world. Moscow leaves us optimistic, since we see that in mankind there is power to throw off decay, in order that new and better forms may blossom. What is happening in Russia is sure to lead Americans and Europeans to an analysis of their own institutions, which will result in reformation. The Russian revolution promises to do for mankind what the American revolution did. When the Lenin centenary rolls round, as now the George Washington celebration is in process, doubtless representatives from England, France and America will be present with congratulations. In our judgment, it is wise to take a century or two into account.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Jottings

Gen. Ma Chen-san is loyal to Marshal Chang Hsueh-liang. —Special despatch from Manchuria in the New York *Times*.

Here is news indeed! We had not imagined that any Chinese general was loyal to anybody but himself.

Havelock Ellis has written that "Progress is the exchange of one nuisance for another nuisance." For example, the aeroplane for the automobile, or the radio for the phonograph!

We passed an automobile station the other day, and saw a glorious electric sign—"Paradise Greasing Palace." Here is America at its best. Sinclair Lewis is at last outdone.

The *Review of Reviews* has a regular editorial department called "The Progress of the World." The job of getting material for this department each month must be the stiffest journalistic task of modern times.

This business of appointing a widow to succeed her late husband in the House of Representatives or in the Senate is being overdone, according to our way of thinking. What's to happen if a bachelor dies? And what if a wife, like Lady Macbeth, gets too ambitious?

Stanley Baldwin says that he wants Protection so that Britain can banish the American language from its shores. "Yeah?" J. H. H.

Mexico Is Becoming Fashionable*

Mexico is becoming popular: One might almost say, fashionable. To be sure, this popularity is the outgrowth of other conditions than those which inspired Americans to go to Mexico a few years ago, engaged upon the sacred mission of brigandage. The evidences of this contemporary popularity are to be seen for one thing in the number of new books which have latterly appeared about Mexico, one of which, at least, has almost achieved for itself the status of a best seller. A few Spanish words begin to fall lightly from our lips. A certain hotel in Pennsylvania offers us " a colorful, riotous, memorable Labor Day *fiesta.*"

It may be that there is a Spanish colony up there in the Pennsylvania mountains and that they have always used the word fiesta without our having paid much attention to it, but it looks very much as though they were trying to exploit this popularity which our recent contacts with Mexico have developed. Senator and Mrs. Dwight Morrow have also popularized Mexico. Mrs. Morrow said that Stuart Chase's book made her homesick; and anybody who has enjoyed the hospitality of Casa Manana, the nearest Spanish equivalent they could get to the house of Morrow, in Cuernavaca; or who may have wandered up and down "our street," as Mrs. Morrow calls it, which runs from a pink church on a hill to a pink sunset on a mountain, will understand something of this growing popularity.

The converse of this is that Americans themselves are becoming more popular in Mexico than used to be the case. For the moment, the bitterness of the old oil scandals has become dormant, partly because oil isn't such a valuable commodity as it used to be, and partly because Senator Morrow, as United States Ambassador, introduced a new method of approach, in singular and startling contrast to the conventional diplomacy of the past; and the Mexicans liked it. When Senator Morrow went to Mexico City, the sign over the entrance to the embassy read, "The American Embassy." Now that has been changed, and reads as follows: "The Embassy of the United States of America."

There is a world of difference in that method of aproach. It may seem inconsequential to us, but strange as it is, it is just as well to recall the fact that Mexicans are Americans quite as much as we are. Dr. Samuel Crothers, in writing about his summer camp in New Hampshire, once said that "Chocorua is not as big as the Matterhorn, but the principle is the same." So, Mexico is not as large as the United States. There are vast differences in tradition, point of view, culture, background, and all the rest; but in theory, at least, both of these countries are republics. The principle is the same.

During the coming months and years it may safely be predicted that this land of light and color, of strange customs and indigenous music will prove increasingly popular among its neighbors to the north. Of course, we might have been enjoying these things for a long time, but we haven't known our neighbors south of the Rio Grande. There are certain reasons for this, which though it is rather late to correct them, may as well be faced now, if perchance there be any lingering remnants of such attitudes.

The first condition which has kept us in ignorance of our Mexican neighbors is the tendency of Anglo Saxons to regard themselves and everything they do as superior to other people and other ways of doing things. Fortunately, conditions over which we have no control are making a magnificent dent in this glorious manifestation of American conceit, and we now know that differences are not necessarily superiorities.

In the second place, we have never known these people to the south of us very well for the reason that it has not been very easy to get there. Of course, that condition is entirely changed, although it ought quickly to be added that it is still a most undesirable place to visit if you mind the altitude, or haven't a strong digestion, and are unable to understand the Spanish language.

Another reason for the barriers which have separated us in the past is that whenever foreigners have gone to Mexico their first and last question was, "What is there in it for us?" It hardly needs to be pointed out that a sympathetic understanding of another people is wholly impossible under such conditions of approach.

Fortunately, there has been a great change in these attitudes. A trip to Mexico is increasingly becoming what Judge Florence Allen, of the Supreme Court of Ohio, refers to as "An Adventure in Understandings." This new method of approach, fortunately, is something more than a pious wish, and has gone so far as to become embodied in a certain measure of organization. One of the organizations which embodies it is the Seminar in Mexico, conducted under the auspices of the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America.

It is interesting to see how such an organization

*First of two articles by Mr. Robinson, who has recently returned from a summer in Mexico.—Editor.

approaches its task of fulfilling this adventure in understanding. Among other things, members of this seminar, some of whom are just back from the sixth session in Mexico City, have had an opportunity to come in direct contact with the United States Ambassador, Mr. Ruben Clark, Jr., and learn from him how he hopes to continue the new diplomacy which has recently been inaugurated there. Not only the historical facts of the Mexican scene have been presented to the members of the seminar, but an opportunity to meet the Mexican people, both leaders and those of complete obscurity. As one moves about amongst these people, there is gradually unfolded the story of the passing of an ancient civilization; while he hears the timid cries of another almost powerless to be born.

There is a certain irreducible minimum of knowledge and contact which is indispensable to an understanding of modern Mexico. You must, for instance, know the story of the Saint of Guadalupe, embodying as it does the fusion of Indian legend and Christian practice. You must not forget that within thirty miles of Mexico City are to be seen the great pyramids of San Juan Teotihuacan, symbols of a mighty past. In the very shadow of these ancient monuments, however, you will find symbols of the new civilization, which is being born in Mexico, in the rural schools which are springing up in the remotest towns and villages.

It is not likely that we of the North will ever be able to gain any appreciation of the suffering through which these natives in Mexico passed during the period of the Spanish conquest. If popular interest develops in Mexico, the story will be repeated with increasing frequency. Bancroft was a conservative historian, and we may probably regard this brief statement of his as moderately free from exaggeration:

> Their existence in this manner without household goods, without home, with scarcely a blanket as their entire wardrobe, and the consequent impossibility of becoming domesticated and living in that ordinary comfort which society should afford everyone through his labor * * * has formed in them a character of idleness, abandonment, and licentiousness responsible for all sorts of vice and disorder. The wisest legislation * * * the severest punishments * * * will not serve to correct this evil in many years if it is not remedied at its root, which would be to provide employment for every idle one and to furnish him a fixed abode.

That has been the story of Mexico pretty much from the beginning right down to the present moment. People frequently ask the question why they have trouble in Mexico; why one revolution seems to follow another in rapid succession. Their whole political story, since Father Hidalgo rang the independence bell in 1810, has been one grand and glorious revolution. There are a great variety of answers to this question of unrest in Mexican affairs.

For one thing, there is the heritage of Spanish cupidity, misgovernment and persecution, through a period of three hundred years. That is not the sort of thing which any people can shake off in a hurry. As Gruening, in his great book upon Mexico, points out: "Anglo-America was settled; Hispano-America was conquered. From this original distinction and its implications, largely derives the wide divergence in the two civilizations.

In the second place, and as a corollary of this Spanish inheritance, these people have had no experience and training in self-government. As soon as they got started under one of the wisest and most unselfish leaders this continent has yet produced, Benito Juarez, their efforts in self-development and education were cut short by the iniquitous dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz. But even if these Mexicans are without experience in self-government, it may be confidently affirmed that visitors from the United States, so far as the safety of their bodies is concerned, are considerably better off in Mexico than in their own country.

And, finally, these Mexicans have had a difficult time of it because of the interference of foreign nations. It is probably inevitable that our memories should be very defective in recalling our own contribution to this fertile field of foreign exploitation. If anybody wants confirmation of it, let him go back to the administration of President Taft, particularly the period during which Henry Lane Wilson was our ambassador to Mexico City, and he will find there such irrefutable evidence of interference on our part in the internal affairs of a friendly people as to make any person with the slightest sense of justice blush for shame.

All that, however, is happily a chapter which is largely closed. We are coming to understand these people better, and as we do understand them, there is ample justification for the growing popularity of Mexico.

ALSON H. ROBINSON.

Hymn

Hail the Hero Workers
  Of the mighty Past!
They whose labor builded
  All the things that last.
Thoughts of wisest meaning,
  Deeds of noblest right;
Patient toil in weakness;
  Battles in the night.
Hail, then, noble workers,
  Builders of the Past!
All whose lives have blest us
  With the gains that last.

Hail, then, Hero Workers
  Who today do hear
Duty's myriad voices
  Sounding high and clear;
You who quick responding
  Haste you to your task,
Be it grand or simple,
  Ye forget to ask.
Hail, ye noble workers,
  Builders of Today,
Who life's treasure gather
  That shall last alway!

Hail, ye Hero Workers,
  Ye who yet shall come,
When to this world's calling
  All our lips are dumb!
Ye shall build more nobly
  If our work be true,
As we pass Life's treasure
  On from Old to New.
Hail ye, then, all workers
  Of all lands and time.
One brave band of heroes,
  With one task sublime.

—Anna Garlin Spencer.

The British Elections

(From Our English Correspondent)

On the 5th of November, 1605, one Guido Fawkes was found attempting to blow up the English Parliament with gunpowder. He failed, but on the 27th of October, 1931, Ramsay MacDonald successfully disposed of it by means of a Tory ramp.

In the course of a few weeks the Englishman in the street has seen a national crisis proclaimed and followed by the somersault of public figures whom he had become accustomed to regard as "set." He has seen a "National" government formed in order to protect the pound and has seen its failure hailed as a blessing by industrialists and Labor alike. Now he has witnessed the men who failed to save the pound gain an unprecedented victory by demanding a blank cheque to continue their ministrations. And the man in the street understands exactly nothing of what it is all about.

It is a great tale for patriots. Faced by the threat of another Labor budget, the May Commission, manned largely by Tories, sprang upon a startled world at the height of an unprecedented crisis in Germany that Britain was insolvent. Thereupon the *Times* and other Tory papers hitherto claiming almost a monopoly of "patriotism," diligently fanned the crisis and stampeded the foreign investor, until one Sunday morning in August MacDonald was told that unless "something drastic was done," the pound would begin to fade away on the Monday. Capitalism had to be saved and MacDonald was their man. It was this threat by the international banking hierarchy which produced what Lloyd George calls the "calamitous folly of October." The "National" Government, having failed to save the pound and being unable to agree upon anything, appealed to the country for a "doctor's mandate," a characteristically British way of saying "dictatorship." And the ramp has succeeded, too well even for MacDonald and his Tories. The country has gone crazily nationalist at a moment when the world is confronted with problems for which there is no solution except on an international basis. And in addition the overwhelming Tory majority can and will claim a mandate to cut the social services to the bone, to open again their feud with Russia just as trade relations with that country were improving, to wreck the hopes of a conciliatory policy in India, to stand pat on "Britain's magnificent example" in disarmament, and finally to impose tariffs which will both wreck the country economically and produce a financial crisis in Germany which may well prove the last straw on the capitalist camel's back.

Lord Grey of Falloden, the war criminal of 1914, said during the elections that he hoped no single Labor candidate would be elected. He nearly had his wish for only 52 of them have been returned as against 471 Conservatives. The National government has a majority with all the odds and ends of nearly 500. Of the 15 women in the new Parliament all are Tories except Megan Lloyd George. This result is partly due to the absurd electoral system, since Labor polled only 20% less than the last time, but retains only 52 seats instead of 280! Roughly there were fifteen million anti-Socialist against seven million Socialist votes; these figures in themselves dispose of the bunk of "national unity," especially when one remembers that several millions were stampeded by the unprecedented scare propaganda. The radio and the press proved the spear head of the Tory class war. Nevertheless it is obvious that Labor has undergone a crushing defeat, which has been confirmed by the municipal elections, in which it lost over 400 seats.

But the elimination of the progressive vote is less important than the fact that the Mother of Parliaments seems to have reached second childhood. The elections were fought on a kind of bastard form of the continental multi-party system. There were Unionists and National, Labor and National Labor, Liberal National, Liberal and Independent Liberal and even a few who could not fit in to any of these. The methods employed in the election were as unpleasant as the result. Included of course were all the distortions and lying inseparable from elections today, but landowners and others freely used the old threat of dismissal if their employees voted Socialist, this explains why the Left printed on their leaflets in such large lettering "remember that the ballot is secret." The notion that the English people have political "genius" is utter nonsense, as a whole they are as politically ignorant as the masses anywhere and more so than in some countries. It was not uncommon to hear unemployed men say that they would vote Tory, "because so and so down the road says he will have this or that job done if the Conservatives get in!" The Bishops too helped to weight the scales by their solemn adjurations to vote for "trustworthy men," Henderson not being among them. But the palm of imbecility must go to the author of a letter in a South Wales paper which read:

> I would remind all that our votes are recorded by means of a cross. That cross should remind us that behind the candidates there is an unseen candidate who seeks the suffrages of all at this time. If folk use the secrecy of the ballot box to vote as in His presence, then the act will become a sacrament, and every vote a prayer for Britain, and then we may face the future with confidence.

To American radicals the most spectacular feature will probably have been the betrayal of the three Labor leaders. It may have its significance in emphasizing the decadence of the Parliamentary system, but its importance can be exaggerated. What has happened almost for the first time in England is a common-place in France. MacDonald has long been known to boast that at heart he is a Tory; since he first took office he has been bearing an increasing resemblance to the tub-thumping parson gone wrong, and Bernard Shaw is right when he says that for the past two years he has said nothing but bunk in public and has now done with sincerity. The overweening vanity which has always been a marked trait has turned to megalomania; the Manchester *Guardian* sarcastically calls it "his exaggerated sense of his own indispensability." Like his friend, Herriot, he has now become openly a Tory nationalist. (Some have honesty thrust upon them!) But the events which mark his moral downfall have brought his greatest material triumph. MacDonald's personality may be nauseating to some, but he can put it across the many and especially the women voters. It is not everyone who can become prime minister under handicaps, and then, over a week-end, change sides. renounce the claims of a life-time and still carry many

thousands with him. He must find his comfort in that, for decent people will never forgive the whining traitor who unchained again the savage insanity of nationalism just as the country was beginning to recover from the last bout.

Thomas, the brilliant leader of the Railwaymen's Trade Union, never was a Socialist, so that to be called a Millerand is no new thing to him.

Snowden's case alone bears a resemblance to tragedy. His vitriolic attacks on his old colleagues in the Rothermere press made sad reading, crammed as they often were with misstatements which could only have been deliberate. But the Communist accusations that he had been bought are nonsense; his case is pathological. Physically he has always been a sick man, today the bitterness which pain has engrained in him turns upon those whom he was unable to convert to his pre-war-Liberal theories of finance. As for the little renegades whose chattering cant adorned the correspondence columns of the Tory press, they are merely useful as indicating once again how many peace time "pacifists" will turn to nationalism at the first windy bluff.

This election means parliamentary dictatorship and probably spells the end of democracy in our time. It may be as well so if we realize that many superstitions must fall before democracy becomes safe for humanity. It can hardly be claimed that electorates so uneducated that they surrender the freedom won by their fathers to men like Rothermere and Beaverbrook, Coty in France, Hearst in America and Hugenberg in Germany are in a fit state to decide upon their countries' policies. For the first time opposition has been practically eliminated from the British Parliament, not only that but an interesting constitutional question is raised by the fact that such opposition as is left is composed, not of men who disagree with the Government, but of quitters and traitors. The very basis of the parliamentary system has been shorn away. With that genius for self-deception so characteristic of them the British have "elected" an anonymous dictator! One of Rothermere's scribes, writing under the caption "Fifteen million Britons cannot be wrong" says:

> The enormous power of the new Government will enable the Cabinet to act with the confident authority which marks the proceedings of the Fascist Grand Council.

It will probably not be long in earning the same degree of unpopularity also.

Moderate Conservatives are of course alarmed by the result of the poll. No top-heavy government has ever succeeded in avoiding doing damage to the country and bringing disaster upon its Party; always a too great majority has resulted either in fierce internal dissension or in control by the unreasoning extremists. If that is true of normal times how much more true must it prove in these tempestuous days! An effort will of course be made to continue the fiction of unity between elements which cannot mix, for the electorate must not too soon be disillusioned as to the trick of which it has been a victim. And in this MacDonald will earn his money for he is notorious for his ability to do nothing under a flood of high-sounding phrases, and in this case it is his only means of prolonging his political life. For this reason the common expectation abroad that drastic Protectionism will immediately be adopted, is probably premature. Tariffs in some form there will be eventually but they will not necessarily be immediate or at first severe. It is far more likely that progressive doses of the poison will be administered until the patient either dies or kicks the "doctors" into the Thames. Nor is it only from the Press Gang whom Mr. Baldwin called the "harlots" of civilization that amusing reactions may be expected. They will certainly scream for the whole hog at once, indeed their papers are already full of pictures of dockers unloading Greek figs and Californian apples, in the attempt to persuade the innocent house-wife that she should begin to economize by paying more for these things. But already there are indications of difficulties elsewhere. When tariffs were still far off the steel industry clamored that it was dying, that tariffs must be applied if another key industry was not to be lost and another million men thrown on the unemployment list. But now with tariffs round the corner, the manufacturer of finished steel products begins to say that, after all, he must have cheap crude steel. We may expect the same symptom to appear in other industries, for it is as difficult to please two industrialists with the same tariff as it is to feed an over-populated island on anything but free trade. We may have a dilatory Tariff Commission, we shall certainly have the lobbying and political corruption so long familiar to France and the United States, but it remains to be seen whether or not Britain will seek to break the record of the little Baltic State of Latvia, which has just prohibited the importation of more than one ton of boots and shoes per year!

But what of the future? There are Socialists who say that gradualism is now dead and that revolutionary tactics must be adopted by Labor. Others believe that Labor is in the wilderness for years and must seek to educate the public against the capitalist press. The first seems to ignore the elementary axiom that revolution can never be "created," and the second presumes that the present system will obligingly encourage them to hasten its own funeral. Both seem as blind to the pace at which things are moving as the reactionaries who so ludicrously suppose that a moribund system can be perpetuated by a "Fascist Grand Council." One thing and one thing only can produce a revolutionary situation in Britain and that thing is hunger. That factor may very possibly be introduced by the breakdown of the already tottering financial system, for, alone among the nations, England would be faced by starvation if the word "credit" became meaningless. A letter from the Governor of the Bank of England to the Governor of the Banque de France has recently been quoted:

> Unless drastic measures are taken to prevent it, the capitalist system throughout the world will be wrecked within the period of a year. I should like this prediction to be filed for future reference.

Filed it is and true it may be, but the fact that the leaders of the financial hierarchy realize that the system of producer credit has reached the end of its tether will not enable them to save it. That there are palliatives which could be applied and which would serve to postpone the collapse is certain. But their adoption requires action through the Parliaments, and that is not forthcoming with nationalism rampant. France in particular, though in a key position, stands outside the ring with her great financial power largely subordinated to the chauvinistic policy of the General Staff. So long as there is any member of the ring who still believes it possible to survive alone though all else falls, the ring itself is powerless and doomed, for its other members must fly more desperately to self-help measures which can but hasten the general collapse.

Despite the insane greed which rots its core, Capi-

tal has withstood some rude blows during the past year. That means may yet be found to postpone the inevitable is possible, but becomes increasingly improbable with every week of inaction which passes. The key lies in Germany and the present Franco-German negotiations must affect the whole world whether they reach some degree of success or fail. For if Germany is not speedily brought back to a position in which she can buy and sell normally, she will break and her collapse will start the fall of all the other paper houses.

HARRISON BROWN.

London, England.

Do We Want Peace?*

The horror of the Great War into which we so reluctantly entered, the misery which attended it and which followed in its train, the even more deplorable conditions to be apprehended in future wars carried on with the diabolical engineering and means which science and invention are providing, give rise to a well-nigh universal demand for some arrangement among the nations to avert a recurrence of such a hideous affair, or even a minor conflict of arms that, in the intricacies of our complex modern life, might defy localization. But such are the peculiarities of human nature, doubtless providentially so arranged that, as a rule, we speedily forget our deepest griefs, our most poignant miseries, and court again, even jest at, the dangers that once brought us affrighted to the point of death.

Time had somewhat assuaged the emotions that made likely our concurrence in any reasonable plan that might be devised by the statesmen of the world to end war, or remove the likelihood of its occurrence, however imperfect it might appear, when the result of their deliberations came before us for approval, giving plotting politicians the opportunity to effect its rejection. Even the international court, set up on their initiative, a feeble step in the direction of the resolution of controversies between nations by peaceful means still, after ten years, awaits the approval of our government. That hesitancy, it is now loudly acclaimed, has been justified by the recent 8 to 7 decision of the Court in the Austro-German Customs Union case. We had once an 8 to 7 decision in this country which threatened for a time to disrupt the Union, but the Republic continues on its majestic course notwithstanding—the incident all but forgotten by those living at the time and noticed by the historian for the edification of generations of later date as without particular significance on the course of our life.

On the question at issue, in the case referred to, whether a reciprocal customs treaty between Austria and Germany is in contravention of the treaty of St. Germain or of the Geneva Protocol forbidding the political union of those countries, one group of judges, including those of French and Italian nationality, held it to be so; another, including those of American, British and German nationality, that it was not. I enter into no controversy as to which group is right. I note only the assumption by American critics, who haven't even read the opinions filed, that the decision was political in character, with the implication that the judges were swayed by the views and desires of the foreign offices of their countries respectively. Of course, that imputation does not extend to Mr. Kellogg. The American government has no views on the legal question, and, for that matter, is utterly indifferent to the question of union. But if it had or if it were concerned as to the matter of union, no American would think his government would convey to Judge Kellogg its hopes in the matter or that he would regard, except with hot resentments, any intimation from it as to what his decision should be. Nor would any American think differently of his predecessor, the present Chief Justice, nor of his predecessor, the eminent jurist, John Bassett Moore, nor of any American lawyer at all likely to be elevated to a place on the court.

But we are asked to believe that, though our government would not privately tender, nor an American judge accept advice, no other country would exercise such restraint and no other judge exhibit fortitude enough to reject and repel it were it offered. Can Phariseeism go farther? Anzilotti of Italy voted with the majority. It is to be gathered from current news that Italy is in no mood to advance the political aims of France. Altamira of Spain was on that side though it is popularly believed that the sympathies of that country were with the Central Powers in the war, and it is in the nature of a revelation that the government at Madrid is controlled from Paris. Guerrero of Salvador and Urrutia of Colombia voted for the French contention, upon what improper consideration no candid critic dare say, at least has not attempted to specify. A more reasonable suggestion is that the nationals of the northern nations embraced the German contention, those of the Latin countries the French, a perfectly honest difference arising from temperament, tradition and training. However that may be, what I desire to emphasize is that the criticism now leveled at the court because of the decision just rendered could be directed with equal force at any world court. It is not contended that the result assailed arose by reason of any vice in the method by which the judges of the Permanent Court of International Justice are selected, nor is it proposed that a better method be adopted. It is based upon the idea that though America and Americans are to be excepted, judges from other countries will listen to the voice of the home government and consult its supposed interests in their decisions. Accordingly such critics are against any World Court, however constituted, unless indeed, it consist of one or more judges all Americans. Candor may be asked of them. Are you in favor of any world court? If so, what method would you propose for the elevation of the judges thereof to escape the weakness or vice you assert to exist in what you choose to call the League of Nations' Court as exemplified in the Anschluss case? What system will accomplish better results in that respect than the one now for ten years in operation by which the judges are elected by the vote of all the powers cooperating, confirmed by the vote of thirteen of the leading powers?

I repeat, these critics want no world court, and they look askance at, if they do not actively oppose, every movement for the peaceful adjustment of international controversies. With a single notable exception the opponents of American association in the League of Na-

*An address delivered before the Goodwill Congress in Chicago, on November 10, 1931.

tions and the World Court, either opposed the Kellogg-Briand outlawry of war treaty or spoke or wrote in scorn of it. Efforts to bring about reduction in armaments by international agreement, either of land or naval forces, have with exceptions, it is true, encountered the antagonism of the same bloc.

The purpose of the President in these times of stress to postpone in part our program of naval construction has aroused their ire. On his devoted head they have recently poured their vials of wrath, because of his attempts to compose the differences which have resulted in a state of war in Manchuria and, *mirabile dictu,* because to that end he has joined with the Council of the League of Nations consisting, as heretofore stated, of representatives of thirteen of the first powers. One is led to believe that in their unrestrained venom toward the League of Nations they would rather that open warfare, involving all the resources in men and money of the Orientals, should ensue than that the League should be credited with a part in averting it. While our State Department, presumably with the approval, if not at the instigation, of the President, was thus engaged under a journalistic barrage, a widely read columnist, in keeping with the policy of the papers for which he writes, gave this contribution to current thought:

> The American contribution to peace would be minding our own business here in America and keeping prepared for anything that may happen. Fewer peace committees, less meddling in Europe and Asia, more airships and submarines would be our best peace program.

That was the peace program of the caveman. That was the peace program of Bismarck. The whole course of history demonstrates the futility of that program for ensuring peace. The very day after the piece of political wisdom just quoted was published the press carried the news that Japan had cordially acquiesced in the plan of joint action on the part of the United States and the League. And on the same day, the public was informed that nineteen American nations had united in an appeal to Bolivia and Paraguay, where clashes had occurred in character not unlike those in Manchuria that disturbed the world, to sign a non-aggression pact and continue their efforts to compose their differences over Chaco without resort to war. The "let 'em fight" policy isn't very strong, apparently, with the people of this continent. Nor should it be. What should be thought of a strong man who sees two boys pummeling each other into insensibility and passes by on the other side? How well does one meet the demands of friendship who sees one friend afflicted with a homicidal rage about to assault another without offering a word to dissuade him from his felonious purpose? Shocking! is the only way the counsel offered to keep hands off the Sino-Japanese quarrel can be adequately characterized. It would be nothing less if no account whatever were taken of material gain or loss upon our part. But the dreadful experience, economically speaking, through which the world is passing, has convinced all who think that the losses attendant upon war are borne by all nations and not alone by the belligerents. A war in the Orient would, undoubtedly, feverishly stimulate trade in some lines, but after peace came we should have two impoverished nations as customers in that quarter of the world that now take annually of our products not less than $400,000,000 worth. Meanwhile the Chinese ports would probably be blockaded shutting off entirely our growing trade with the Celestial republic, which now amounts to $300,000,000 a year, and adding to the embarrassing unemployment problem that confronts us. We might, of course, become involved in the quarrel by acting the part of peacemaker, though the chances of such ill-luck are remote. But, however imminent is the risk it is no greater than that of being drawn in should the fight get under way. Our enterprising traders would not tamely submit to the loss of business with China to the amount of $300,000,000 annually, and all sorts of controversies would promptly spring up with Japan over efforts to get goods into and out of China in spite of a blockage, or even in connection with perfectly legitimate trade with Indo-China or India generally, on the one hand, and Siberia on the other, should Japan emulate or even imitate the naval policy of Great Britain in the World War prior to our entrance into it, or worse, though not so likely adopt the "schrecklichkeit" policy of Germany. Even so, there is left out of the reckoning the chance, by no means remote, that Russia would get into the fracas and Europe, in consequence, again be set ablaze.

Harboring, apparently, the hope that the friendly offices of the United States and the League will prove futile, we are told that Japan never will get out of Manchuria, just as we were told that she never would get out of Shantung or Siberia, and half apologies for her remaining are offered in the way of precedents of similar imperialistic aggressions on the part of other powers in days past, the effect, if not the purpose, of which is to spur the militarists of Japan to insist on staying in Manchuria, to extend the area occupied by them, and to precipitate the conflict.

With an arrogant show of superior patriotism, disregarding the intimate relationship which has sprung up among the people of the world through the magical improvements that a century and a quarter have brought in the means of transportation and communication, there are those who stridently insist that our country do nothing to avert foreign wars, lest it be thereby drawn into them. They affect a keener solicitude for the American boy than those who regard it as in the interest of the same American boy to do something to avert wars into which he might be drawn. Both classes labor to the same end—to save the American boy from involvement in a war that is primarily no concern of ours.

While conceding the high-mindedness of the isolationists, those of us who do not concur in the do-nothing policy, though invective be hurled at us, our motives impugned, our patriotism questioned, modestly maintain that ours is the more effective, the more Christian policy and, I may add, it has the approval, as I believe, of the vast majority of the American people.

If anything that has been said is regarded as either a eulogium or a defense of the League of Nations, the World Court, the Kellogg Pact, or any other particular compact or device the ostensible purpose of which is to avert war, I disclaim any purpose to constitute myself, at this time, the protagonist for any of them or any purpose except to combat opposition to all such and to cultivate a hospitable attitude toward any reasonable effort, either general or special, to banish war from our annals.

It is a mistake to assume, as is often assumed, that such an attitude negatives the idea of a national defense policy, and that those who adhere to it are willing to rely wholly upon international agreements, believing

that a world regeneration has ensued. Too well it is recognized that no such transformation has taken place. The League of Nations presupposes no such miraculous change. Indeed it is builded upon the idea that man is still afflicted with the passions that have bred war in the past and are likely to do so in the future—ambition, greed, racial antagonism, commercial rivalry. It is because they still influence human conduct and the course of nations that institutions like the League are brought into existence. Were such passions banished from the earth there were no need of restraining covenants. So, it is assumed, as stated, that there is some incompatibility between the advocacy of arrangements such as those mentioned and support of an adequate army and navy. It by no means follows that because they are entered into the country is to be left to the precarious protection they afford, though a difference of opinion as to what is an adequate army and navy may be expected between those who attribute some virtue to them and those who believe them or profess to believe them utterly futile and who exhibit unrestrained glee at every appearance of failure through such to effect adjustments of differences between nations or forestall a conflict of arms. Worse still, who exhibit a high degree of satisfaction at every failure of efforts to secure a limitation or reduction of armament by international agreement and assume a critical attitude toward every small measure of success which may attend any such.

Despite disappointments, however, progress toward world peace is being made; for though the cause, like freedom is often lost, it's ever won. The conviction grows that, save when waged in the sacred cause of liberty, there is no profit in war for any of the participants and loss for all. Its horrors multiply. Then the mechanization of warfare is taking all the poetry out of it. The Charge of the Light Brigade could never have been written of a tank attack. Let no one despair. Heaven is not reached at a single bound nor a warless world attained by any single step. The yearning for such, which it is the mission of the churches to stimulate, grows apace and it can not be that man who has conquered so many scourges of the race will not eventually find a way, though the task be a tedious one, to eliminate the most hideous among them all.

(Senator) Thomas J. Walsh.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Autumn Thought

Each human life's a river
That meets the sea of death.
There is no other journey
For perishable breath.

Then let us make the flowing
Of life essential joy,
A gleaming heritage
For every girl and boy:—

Belief in comradeship
And faith in worlds to come
And a God who builds His temple
Within a city slum.

Sylvia Hill.

Injustice

Little ragged boy
Standing on the street—
Just another scene of justice
In defeat.

Poor, frail mother
Slaving life away—
She is only one of millions
Doomed to-day.

Sad man in chains,
Life wasted thus—
He's a ghost which haunts the grabbing
Ones of us.

O, maniac,
Fastened in a cell,
They stole your gift of heaven, left you
Mad with hell.

Warren Ariail.

Toiler

All the day long and far into the night,
She sewed on dresses that rich women wear
A time or two, then cast them out of sight
For something newer they may find elsewhere.

And though her eyes might ache and fingers too,
Remarks like these composed her daily food:
"My gown lacks chic," "if altered this will do,"
Then she would rip and sew again and brood.

Helen Adams Parker.

Echo of Ages

The ages echo with measuring beat
The drums of war and marching feet,
The spirit's moaning, the human cry . . .
Who is the god of war, and why?

Desire for power ensuing from greed
That kills, and scorns an enlightened creed,—
That mires the soul in a dismal fen . . .
For he is sin in the hearts of men!

The ages echo the Gospel of Joy:
Good-will and peace without alloy,—
The angel song of a glowing sky . . .
Who is the God of peace, and why?

The guileless One on a rugged cross
To purge the world from enthralling dross,
And free the soul from a dismal fen . . .
For He is Christ in the hearts of men!

Jewel Fuller Lang.

All good works whatever are not worth one-sixteenth part of love, which sets free the heart. Love which sets free the heart comprises them all; it shines, gives light and radiance. Just as the light of all the stars is not one-sixteenth part of the light of the moon; just as, in the last month of the rains, during the season of autumn, when the sky is clear and cloudless, the Sun mounts up on high and overcomes the darkness in the firmament; just as, in the last hour of night, when dawn is breaking, the morning star shines and gives light and radiance; even so does love which sets free the heart and comprises all good works, shine and give light and radiance to all the world.

* * *

Be guided by your power of discrimination derived from your implicit faith in God, keep your mind under control of such a power and nobly sacrifice the self.

* * *

Faith only begins where reason stops.

—*Gandhi.*

Correspondence

Rights of Conscience—the Macintosh Case

EDITOR OF UNITY:

One of the sharp points of difference between English-speaking peoples and other peoples during the past two hundred years has been the general recognition by the former of rights of conscience. Both America and England have "Conscience Clauses" incorporated in their laws which acknowledge religious scruples.

A nation educated in false principles, either by its government or literature, deteriorates in its sense of obligation to God and humanity. We say of such a country that "it has lost its conscience." Dr. Muhlon, a native of Germany and at one time a director of Krupp's, in his book, "The Vandal of Europe," shows that the typical German prior to the Great War—and the Germans are a splendid people—had permitted his idealism and better emotions to be undeveloped in connection with his obedience to a great military machine, that he is naturally kind-hearted, that he has been trained into doing things he is told to do, but, "once disturbed, he . . . lacks any higher capacity of discrimination; because he merely does his duty and recognizes no such thing as individual conscience." What an indictment of misdirected education and authority!

"Ignorance is the everlasting mother of intolerance." Intolerance seeks to crush conscience. Conscience ever contends with intolerance and ignorance and, history reveals that if conscience is victorious, the world is the gainer in light, righteousness and peace.

Lord Parmoor, the eminent English jurist, in a note introducing, "I Appeal Unto Caesar," published in London in 1917, declares that the supreme test of civil liberty is the determination to give full protection to an unpopular minority in times of national excitement. He says: "There is a curious confusion of thought in stigmatizing a deep sense of religious duty as though it were a mean attempt to evade the claims of a national obligation." Again, "It is forgotten that obedience to conscience is a primary duty in Christian ethics."

Gilbert Murray, Professor Regius of Oxford University, wrote in the same book in 1917 on behalf of men then suffering for conscience's sake in England, "All the conscientious objectors known in history have been exasperating, otherwise people would not have persecuted them. Think of the early Christians who were offered complete freedom on condition of performing a slight act of courtesy to the emperor's statue and refused it."

The case of genuine conscientious objectors to military service is to the point. During the Great War much suffering in some instances was imposed upon this class of citizens in England. Some leading statesmen and churchmen and a few liberal newspapers of the widest circulation protested against the treatment they were then receiving. In the midst of much public discussion, Lord Hugh Cecil, the leading layman of the Established Church, voiced in Parliament (1917) a powerful defense of conscientious objectors to military service. In part he declared:

"You say that the safety of the state is the supreme law—there is nothing beyond it. It is a doctrine not novel; indeed, it is now notorious. It is precisely what Bethmann-Hollweg said. . . . We are Christians first; we are Englishmen afterwards. And the Christian faith claims us absolutely—body and soul. . . . By our common religion, as laid down by St. Paul, if men think an action wicked, to them it is wicked—you do not violate their conscience. You only say they are mistaken. And to punish mistakes of opinion is to go back to the old familiar ground of religious persecution. (A great outburst of cheers.) To force another man's conscience is against my conscience. Belief in the state (as a religion) is barren and degrading." —(London *Daily News,* Nov. 21, 1917.)

Not all who have claimed to be genuine in their convictions with respect to opposition to war have been so. It has been said that the average officer of the regular army, during the Great War, while not always able to agree with the real objectors, generally had respect for the stand they took. Genuine objectors to military training or service cannot be classed with criminals, skulkers, or unpatriotic citizens—they are the reverse. Some of them have been well known for personal bravery. Others, because of their convictions, suffered medieval punishment when, by yielding, they could have secured easement or promotion for themselves. Their known record for clean living has been exceptional—they have represented a standard of morality that is admitted to be one of the great safeguards of the state. They have evidenced their desire faithfully to aid the state in ways that did not conflict with the teachings of Jesus. Men of such moral fibre, of religious convictions are tremendously needed in our national life.

When the demands of constituted authority clash with the instructions of Jesus Christ, what course is open to those who desire to be faithful to him? In one of the very first statements made by the early Christians they said to their rulers: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to harken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye." (Acts IV:19). Since then many Christians have felt that their first obligation was to their Lord. History reveals that, though often misunderstood at the time, they were in many instances thereby rendering the finest service to the state.

Some peoples, after attaining national greatness, have submitted to attacks upon the conscientious convictions of their citizens and, unrecognized by themselves at the time, have declined in spiritual vision from that hour. Most of the backward or shattered nations of the present day are the ones that have been the slowest to recognize that there is an inner life which is a man's own. Oliver Cromwell seems to have appreciated this when, in the midst of the bitter civil wars of England, he declared: "If the poorest Christian, the most mistaken Christian, shall desire to live peaceably and quietly under you—I say if any shall desire to lead a life of Godliness and honesty, let him be protected." No wonder George Washington declared in a letter, now on deposit in a Philadelphia library: "The conscientious scruples of all men should be treated with great delicacy and tenderness."

The United States was founded by men and women who came to these shores that they might enjoy civil and religious liberty. But ominous changes are taking place. The recent decision of the Supreme Court by a vote of 5 to 4 denying citizenship to the distinguished clergyman, Dr. Macintosh, because he could not conscientiously promise to bear arms under all circumstances, is a case in point. He stated that "his first allegiance was to the will of God." Chief Justice Hughes, in the minority report, declared that "in the forum of conscience, duty to a moral power higher than the State has always been maintained. The reservation of that supreme obligation, as a matter of principle, would unquestionably be made by many of our conscientious and law-abiding citizens. The essence of religion is belief in a relation to God involving duties superior to those arising from any human obligation." This legal opinion, decided by a majority of one, has developed a storm of anxiety in Protestant circles. This legal decision, this new interpretation of the law, this old Prussian idea that first obligation is to a possibly fallible government that happens to be in power and not to God, is a new thing in America. It is admitted that the implications and dangers connected with establishing a religious test for citizenship are very great. But the law upon which this decision is based can be altered by congress. Our Christian voters are urged to write to the President of the United States and to their congressmen asking that a change be made in the law at an early date.

WILLIAM C. ALLEN.

Denver, Colorado.

Gandhi May Possibly Come to America

EDITOR OF UNITY:

Dr. Frederick B. Fisher is managing a movement which has for its object the bringing of Mahatma Gandhi to this country as soon as circumstances allow—at least before he returns to India. The following letter explains itself:

Ann Arbor, Michigan,
November 16, 1931.

My dear Dr. Fisher:

In response to your request, I take pleasure in stating that in the past I have opposed the coming of Mahatma Gandhi to America (and I have cabled him to that effect), because I have feared that our sensational press would treat him as an unbalanced agitator and a freak, and thus lessen his influence in this country and England, and hurt the great cause which he represents.

But now, with the understanding that if he comes, he

is to be received and welcomed by a strong committee of eminent and honored Americans, who will direct his movements and present him to the American public everywhere as the great statesman that he is and as the accredited representative of a great historic nation in a struggle for freedom which is of serious import not only to India but to Great Britain and to the entire world; and further, with the understanding that a responsible nation-wide press association pledges itself to report his movements and his utterances in this country in the spirit of justice and fairness and with the dignity which his high character and the importance of his mission deserve,—in view of these two important understandings, I have changed my opinion, and I believe that a visit to America, made by him as soon and at such time as may suit his convenience, will be wise and useful in creating here a true appreciation of his aims and of the entire Indian situation.

Very sincerely yours,

To Dr. Frederick B. Fisher, Jabez T. Sunderland.

Ann Arbor, Michigan.

From a Letter to a UNITY Subscriber

Dear————.

I have greatly enjoyed the various numbers of Unity magazine which you have so kindly sent me from time to time, and write now to thank you for it. One who gives thirty-two weeks a year to the lecture platform cannot be encumbered with large magazines, and I find that this little journal is exceedingly useful.

Wheaton, Ill. L. W. Rogers.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 170)

employment, health, old age and other forms of disability.

(c) The reduction of hours and days of labor as rapidly as the development of machinery and technique make possible to a point commensurate with the need or consumption.

Seventh: We deplore general wage cuts at this time as socially unjust and calculated to intensify bitterness and industrial unrest.

Eighth: We recognize that even the best cooperated planning within the nation is not enough, and we urge the extension of such planning to world proportions. Questions of tariffs, international debt, reparations, world finance, and the economic waste of armament must be dealt with on a world basis to insure international stability.

On the Denial of Citizenship to Douglas Clyde Macintosh

Whereas, we Unitarians here assembled, have been pledged by our traditions to uphold freedom of conscience, and have been devoting this present Conference to the theme of the supreme worth of personality in all its relationships; and,

Whereas, It has been declared by the Supreme Court of the United States that Douglas Clyde Macintosh, Professor in the Divinity School in Yale University, is not eligible for citizenship in the United States, for the reason that he could not promise in advance to bear arms in any war in which the United States may be engaged, "unless he believed the war to be morally justified"; and,

Whereas, The decision of the Court was by a majority of five to four, the majority opinion declaring that the promise to bear arms is implied in the words of the oath of the Naturalization Act, "to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic"; and,

Whereas, The minority opinion, Chief Justice Hughes speaking, declared that there was no such implication, either literally or historically, in the general words of the Naturalization Oath, and that such a requirement to bear arms "should not be implied because such a construction is directly opposed to the spirit of our institutions and to the historical practice of Congress"; and,

Whereas, The majority opinion went beyond its interpretation of the Naturalization Act and declared that "the conscientious objector is relieved from the obligation to bear arms in obedience to no constitutional provision, expressed or implied; but because and only because, it has accorded with the policy of Congress thus to relieve him",—

Be It Resolved, That we Unitarians who are here assembled, while respecting the judicial procedure in this case and with no purpose to call in question the legality of the decision, nevertheless declare that we feel profoundly moved to protest against it; that the majority opinion looks backward upon precedents in the past, while the minority opinion looks forward with the growing sentiments of the American people against the war system, thus interpreting the naturalization oath in harmony with the moral conscience increasingly felt by American citizens as to whether they can or cannot approve and support a declaration of war;

Be It Further Resolved, That we feel a deepening dismay at the decision of the Supreme Court to the effect, first; that liberty of conscience, even in the bearing of arms in any or all wars, has no guarantee whatsoever in the Constitution of the United States but only in the judgment of Congress, a decision which appears to subject all citizens, and especially all office-holders taking the oath of office in substantially the same terms of the naturalization oath, to the implied promise in advance to bear arms in any and all wars of the nation no matter what religious scruples may be felt; and, second; that the decision puts a construction upon the Constitution contrary to our American practice in all its history, because it definitely assures to Congress the right of universal conscription of conscience without regard to religious scruples in the bearing of arms.

Be It Further Resolved, That we who approve these resolutions, pledge ourselves to all possible efforts to move Congress to find some relief, if necessary, in a constitutional amendment, from the intolerable results of the Supreme Court decision, as it affects both the native-born citizen and the applicant for citizenship who have or feel that they may have religious scruples in the bearing of arms in war, though subject, it may be, to noncombatant duties.

Be It Further Resolved, That we extend our sympathy to Professor Macintosh in his dilemma and to all others in the same plight.

On Relief of Destitute in Mining Regions

Whereas, The Fourth Biennial Conference of the American Unitarian Association meeting in Philadelphia has had brought to its attention the deplorable situation existing in the soft coal regions of West Virginia, Southern Illinois and Kentucky, whereby thousands of men, women and children are utterly destitute and in need of food, clothing and shelter; and

Whereas, This Conference recognizes with deep appreciation the efforts being made by the Friends' Service Committee at the request of the Federal Children's Bureau and the American Red Cross to undertake the organization and distribution of relief in these areas; and

Whereas, It seems that in this definitely Christian service our free churches will wish to play a part—be it hereby

Resolved, That this Conference requests the American Unitarian Association to direct its executive officers to send out an appeal for assistance to all churches, members of the Association; and be it further—

Resolved, That a committee consisting of the secretary of the department of social relations of the American Unitarian Association, the chairman of the social service committee of the Women's Alliance, and Dr. Frederick R. Griffin of Philadelphia be appointed to study the situation at first hand, and to work out details of cooperation with the Friends.

Concerning the Disarmament Conference

Whereas, the forthcoming Disarmament Conference marks the most important crisis in world history since Versailles, and since the United States has a vital concern in, and a definite responsibility for the preservation of the peace of the world, which would be jeopardized by the failure of this Conference, and since the United States cannot afford to take the stand that limitation of land and air armaments are purely matters of European concern, and

Whereas, the preamble to part Five of the Peace Treaties, including the Treaty of Berlin between the United States and Germany contains a moral, if not a legal, obligation to disarmament, and

Whereas, the Pact of Paris (Kellogg Pact) signed by fifty-eight nations of the world, renounces war as an instrument of national policy and thereby calls for immediate steps

toward general disarmament that the nations may put the same trust in their peace treaties that they have hitherto put in military alliances and armament;

Be It Therefore Resolved, That the Fourth Biennial Conference of the American Unitarian Association calls upon the churches to do their utmost to further the study of the issues to come before the Disarmament Conference in order that the people of the churches may bring the force of public opinion in America to accomplish the successful issue of the forthcoming Disarmament Conference.

Be It Further Resolved, that we urge that the government of the United States appoint the strongest possible delegation to the Conference, composed of civilians, with at least one outstanding statesman not officially connected with the Government; and formulate a constructive policy which shall include,

A. Acceptance of the principle of budgetary limitation.

B. Proposals for progressive reduction in total expenditures such as, 10% a year, until all forces are reduced to a police status for the maintenance of law and order.

C. Proposals for immediate direct reduction of naval armaments, including the abolition of submarine and of all surface war vessels over 10,000 tons.

D. Prohibition of the preparation for and use of poison gas, chemical and bacteriological methods of warfare.

E. Acceptance of the establishment of a permanent Disarmament Commission to watch over the execution of the Treaty.

F. The advocacy of the abolition of private manufacture of munitions.

And Be It Further Resolved That We Urge,

A. The adherence of the United States to the World Court before the Disarmament Conference meets.

B. That inasmuch as one of the greatest obstacles to mutual understanding and the reduction of armament at the General Disarmament Conference is the existence of intergovernmental debts and reparations growing out of the last war and carrying with them the hates of which new war is born; the United States as the ultimate creditor take the lead in seeking the cancellation of inter-allied war debts and reparations on condition that armaments are limited and drastically reduced.

C. That the United States formulate a policy setting forth what steps we would be prepared to take to preserve the peace in case of a threatened violation of the Kellogg Pact.

On Filipino Independence

Whereas, according to the Jones Act, adopted by the Congress of the United States in 1916 for the government of the Philippines, "it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein"; and

Whereas, the Senate hearings on the Hawes-Cutting Bill (S. 3822) revealed the significant fact that all concerned agree that the present situation of uncertainty as to the political future of the Philippines should be removed;

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the American Unitarian Association assembled in Philadelphia for its Biennial Conference October 19-22, 1931, appeal to the President and Congress of the United States to define what is meant by "stable government" in the terms of the Jones Act, to set a definite date for the fulfillment of its promise to the Philippines, and to prepare the way by immediate legislation for the granting of complete independence.

Critical and Creative!

The New Humanist

for November and December

Christianity, Socialism and Humanism
by Harold P. Marley

Humanism and the Drama
by Ramsden Balmforth

In Defense of Paganism
by Fred Gladstone Bratton

A Humanistic Conception of the Soul
by Oliver L. Reiser

Notes on Recent American Painting
by Raymond S. Stites

Humanist Controversy in England
by Edwin H. Wilson

Single Copies, Twenty Cents
Yearly, One Dollar

Note: A year's subscription to the New Humanist and a copy of Walter Lippmann's "A Preface to Morals" will be sent for $1.65.

THE NEW HUMANIST
14 West First Street
DAYTON, OHIO

INDIA TODAY AND TOMORROW SERIES

Edited by
HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR, M.A., PH.D.
Friend and Biographer of Gandhi

In view of the unprecedented crisis in India and the amazing meagreness of news dribbling through British censorship it has been deemed advisable to launch the *India Today and Tomorrow Series.* Our attempt will be to present first hand, reliable and documentary material regarding India's non-violent revolution which redounds to the credit of Gandhi and his fellow-countrymen and promises the birth of a warless world. When this glorious chapter of human history is in the making, there is no need to apologize for capturing its salient features and preserving them for posterity.

The series of five numbers as contemplated at present will consist of:

No. 1 INDIA'S NON-VIOLENT REVOLUTION (Published).

No. 2. THE PESHAWAR TRAGEDY (Published).

No. 3. THE STORY OF PEACE NEGOTIATIONS (Soon ready).

No. 4. THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE (In preparation).

No. 5. THE UNITED STATES OF INDIA (In preparation).

Make sure of your full set of this series by sending in a dollar promptly.

This is not a money-making venture—we want to spread the truth about India. One dollar will bring you the entire set of the series.

Please send your dollar to

INDIA TODAY AND TOMORROW SERIES
20 Vesey Street
New York City

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 0489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.